

21st August 1925]

Malabar Affairs.

Compensation to Mr. Theyyunni Menon for losses during the Mappilla rebellion.

* 318 Q.—Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN: Will the hon. the Law Member, the hon. the Member for Revenue, the hon. the Home Member and the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a petition from one C. Theyyunni Menon, Manager of the Elementary School at Ariyur, near Mannarghat in Malabar, requesting that a sum of Rs. 300 may be given to him as compensation for the destruction of his school building by the Mappillas in the recent rebellion;

(b) whether it is a fact that the military operating in the locality occupied the building and that the Mappillas set fire to it only after their advent;

(c) whether the subdivisional officer of Malappuram has made any inquiries on the subject and whether he is satisfied that the petitioner's is a fit case for granting compensation;

(d) whether the petitioner Theyyunni Menon has put up at his own cost a new building for his school and is conducting it; and

(e) whether the Government propose to give any compensation to the petitioner; if not, why not?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b), (c) & (d) The Government have no information on these points.

(e) No; the Government are not prepared to consider any further claims for compensation for losses arising out of the Mappilla rebellion.

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN:—“Sir, with regard to the answer to clauses (b), (c) and (d) I find that the Government have no information. May I ask the Government whether whenever any substantial allegations are made in an application, it is not necessary for the Government and fair to the party concerned that the Government make an investigation and satisfy themselves whether the allegations are true or false?”

The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“I am anxious not to be considered guilty of any discourtesy. It was because the Government came to the conclusion that no further claims for compensation should be considered, that they thought it unnecessary to make any further inquiry as to the conditions, precedent on which alone claims for damages should be considered.”

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN:—“May I bring to the notice of the Government that this is not a new claim. The matter was pending before the local authorities, and the party could not proceed further simply because the district authorities had not disposed of the application in proper time.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“May I ask whether the application was sent early enough or after it was time barred?”

The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“There is no question of time bar. There are certain claims for compensation which were preferred. It is not necessary for me to go into the question whether they are

[21st August 1925]

rightly filed or wrongly filed. But the Government came to the conclusion that if such claims were entertained there was no knowing where they would stop, and that they should not therefore undertake any liability."

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN:—"The fact is that the applicant preferred a claim immediately after the school building was burnt down, and the petition was pending before the district authorities and they disposed of the question summarily, and then the petitioner brought it to the notice of the Government. I therefore suggest that it is but fair that the Government should consider the question on its merits."

Panchayat Courts.

Depressed class representative in the South Village Panchayat Court, Coimbatore.

* 319 Q.—Mr. R. VEERIAN: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware that one Ranga Panoady, a member of the depressed classes, was duly elected as one of the members of the South Village Panchayat Court, Coimbatore town, during the month of July last and his name was subsequently gazetted;

(b) if so, why he was not called upon until now to attend the meeting of the village panchayat court;

(c) whether he was formally informed of his election either by quoting the gazette or otherwise; and

(d) if the Government have no information with reference to clause (a), whether they will be pleased to call for the information?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) It is understood that the court has arranged to meet on fixed days in each week and to dispense with the formal notice in regard to each meeting and that in pursuance of this practice no notice was sent to the newly-elected member.

(c) The Revenue Divisional Officer has since informed the member of his election and the latter is now reported to be attending the court.

(d) Does not arise.

Mr. R. VEERIAN:—"With reference to clause (b) may I know why there was so much delay of about four or five months after the election of that Adi-Dravida was declared by the Revenue Divisional officer, and that too after referring the matter to the head of the administration?"

The hon. Sir C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"As will appear from clause (b) of the answer, the court had fixed certain days, Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays for meetings. The members of the court and the Divisional officer took it for granted that the newly elected member would have come to know that the court was meeting on such days. Mr. Veerian and other gentlemen who took an interest in the matter apparently found out that the gentleman had not received information about the meetings, and Mr. Veerian has drawn the attention of the Government to that fact, and the Government pointed out that a